

two eggs each, and four with three eggs each were observed. The above is the earliest date of arrival of the birds of which I have any knowledge. This island has now been posted, and the Terns are likely to have better protection than ever before. — GEORGE H. MACKAY, *Nantucket, Mass.*

Onychoprion, not *Haliplana*. — As I have remarked before (Pr. Philada. Acad., 1862, p. 555), “Wagler’s *Onychoprion* is based upon the *S[terna]*, *serrata* of Forster; while his *Haliplana* has as type *S. fuliginosa*, Gm. The former of these species . . . is in all probability identical with *fuliginosa*, and is at all events strictly congeneric with it. This being the case, perhaps *Onychoprion* ought to be employed for the genus; as it is instituted several pages in advance of *Haliplana*” in *Isis*, 1832. I now find the case to be exactly as I surmised 35 years ago. The synonymy of the Sooty Tern section of *Sterna*, so far as Wagler is concerned, is: *Onychoprion*, *Isis*, 1832, p. 277, type *serrata* Forst., = *fuliginosa*; *Planetis*, *Isis*, 1832, p. 1222, type *guttata* Forst., = *fuliginosa*; *Haliplana*, *Isis*, 1832, p. 1224, type *fuliginosa*. All three names are thus based on one species, and all bear the same ostensible date; but of actual priority of *Onychoprion* there is no question, as reference to the dates of parts of *Isis* for 1832 shows.

The specific name of another bird of the subgenus *Onychoprion* must be changed from the misspelling “*anæthetus*” of our Check-List, for we have absurdly adopted a mere misprint, besides failing to observe grammatical gender. Our rules allow us the privilege of correcting a typographical error, as dropping of the *s* in this case certainly is; and though *Sterna* was once of common gender, it is feminine now, both by analogy of form and by common consent. The full form of the word would be *anæsthetica*, as in my ‘Key,’ etc.; but lest I be accused of wanton ‘purism,’ I will compound that felony by accepting *anæstheta*, (Gr. ἀναίσθητος, stolid, unfeeling, apathetic).

Our mistake regarding *Onychoprion* is counterbalanced by a reverse error. Having ignored actual priority in this case, we turn around and bestow a fictitious priority upon *Sterna tschegrava* Lepechin, to avoid using the established name *S. caspia*. These two names are ostensibly of same date, 1770, in same part of same volume of the publication in which they both appear; and there is no evidence that the 82 pages concerned (p. 500 to p. 582) make a difference of a day or an hour in actual date of publication. Why then drop *caspia* for *tschegrava*, except to show how great we can be in little things? I shall continue to use *caspia*; and so will all other ornithologists, when the flurry and hurry and worry of our Check-List is over. — ELLIOTT COUES, *Washington, D. C.*

Remarks on certain Procellariidæ. — On reviewing these objects of my early solicitude (1864–66), chiefly in the light of Salvin’s recent admirable Monograph, I observe that a number of classificatory and nomenclatural changes are required in the A. O. U. List, besides those which the Committee adopted in ‘The Auk’ of last January, or then deferred.

1. We have done well in separating Diomedidæ¹ as a family apart from Procellariidæ, and also in declining to raise Oceanitinæ to full family rank. While we may not follow Mr. Salvin to the length of recognizing Puffinidæ as a family (though he certainly gives some good characters, cranial and other), it is quite true that we must adopt several more subfamilies than now appear on our List:

- a. FULMARINÆ. Equivalent to the Fulmaræ and Prionæ of my early papers; including among our genera *Daption*. I failed to recognize the real character of this group, which is the lamelIROSTRAL bill, seen at its best in the exotic genus *Prion*. The lamellæ are obsolete or hardly evident in the true Fulmars, but easily seen in *Daption*, a form which connects the extremes perfectly.
- b. PUFFININÆ. Equivalent to the Puffinæ and Cestrelatæ of my early papers; which two groups come sufficiently near together. None of these birds have any lamellation of the bill, but all share basipterygoids with the Fulmarinæ.
- c. PROCELLARIINÆ. Restricted to the short-legged "Stormy" Petrels.
- d. OCEANITINÆ. The remarkably grallatorial "Stormy" Petrels, as they stand at present in the A. O. U. List.

2. *Priocella* and *Priofinus* are perfectly good genera, the former of Fulmarinæ, the latter of Puffininae. They have stood as such in the 'Key' since 1884, and should never have been degraded. *Priocella*, in fact, is so different from *Fulmarus*, with which the A. O. U. combines it, that Mr. Salvin puts it in the other subfamily:

3. *Cymodroma* should not have replaced *Fregetta* — a word which is sufficiently different from *Fregata*, according to our orthographic (or rather cacographic) rules. Our canon on the subject does not permit us to rule out names which are differently spelled, if more than grammatical gender of terminal inflection be involved: witness *Leptotila*, etc.

4. *Puffinus stricklandi*. I think it very likely that, as held by Mr. Salvin, all the large Sooty Shearwaters must be united under *P. griseus*. But if we propose to separate the Atlantic bird from that of the Pacific, its name is *P. fuliginosus*. For, though there are several cases of prior use of the term *Procellaria fuliginosa*, for various birds of different genera, I find no use of *Puffinus fuliginosus* for any species prior to Strickland, 1832; and certainly preoccupation of a specific name in one genus never debars its use in another genus. The earliest use of *Procellaria fuliginosa* appears to be by Gmelin, 1788, for the Sooty Petrel of Latham, now *Oceanodroma fuliginosa*; but this in no wise affects the standing of *Puffinus fuliginosus*. — ELLIOTT COUES, *Washington, D. C.*

¹ Still more distinct from other *Tubinares* are the exotic *Pelecanoididæ*, the full family rank of which I indicated in Pr. Phila. Acad., 1868, p. 54; and I should not have degraded this group in later writings.